

**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL: Designing of a  
Standardized Format for R&D Organization**
**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORT (APAR) FOR SCIENTISTS (Middle Level)**

Name of the Scientist \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grade \_\_\_\_\_  
 Lab/Estt \_\_\_\_\_

Discipline \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sub Discipline \_\_\_\_\_  
 Year \_\_\_\_\_

**Guidelines to fill up the form**

1. For the organisation to realize its mission and objectives, every member of the organisation needs to perform to his/her potential. R&D organization values appraisal to have tremendous motivational impact on people through goal setting, meaningful feedback, and recognition. The present appraisal system has been designed to integrate individual goals with organization's mission and objectives.
2. Initial discussions are required to be done between the Initiating Officer (IO) and the scientists to set the targets for next year and discuss the previous year's performance, followed by impediments and facilities, facts at work place.
3. In part IV, IO shall be grading the scientist on all the sub-attributes. Reviewing Officer (RO) can modulate the final score given by IO on each category i.e. Work output, Personal attributes, Functional Competency. Finally the Head of the establishment can modulate the final grading in the end if there is any significant variance in the IO and RO score.
4. APAR has got the provision for representation within 15 days. If the concerned APAR Section does not receive any information from the assessee on or before 15 days from the date of disclosure, the APAR will be treated as final.
5. The competent authority for considering unfavorable or adverse remarks shall consult the Accepting authority and decide the matter objectively within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the representation. The competent authority after due consideration may reject/accept the representation and modify the APAR accordingly. The decision of the competent authority and the final grading shall be communicated to the assessee reported upon within 15 days of receipt of the decision of the competent authority by the concerned APAR Section.
6. Next year's targets shall be broadly finalized during at the beginning of the Annual term and copy of it to be retained by Initiating officer, the candidate and the office.
7. Targets can be changed on new project assignments, or transfer from one lab to other lab, in consultation with IO/or can be reviewed half yearly.
  - *Spacing can be increased/decreased as per the Individual/ organizational requirements*

**PART-I**

**(To be filled by Office)**

1. Name and grade of the Scientist : \_\_\_\_\_
2. Laboratory/ Establishment : \_\_\_\_\_
3. Period of Report : \_\_\_\_\_
4. Date of Birth : \_\_\_\_\_
5. Date of Posting to present Lab/Estt: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Date of Appointment to present post: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Present Basic Grade Pay & Date of acquiring it: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Reasons for taking leave other than CL, EL, Medical : \_\_\_\_\_
9. Academic Qualifications :

<b>Degree</b>	<b>Institution/University</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Grade/Division/CGPA</b>
In chronological order (from B.E/B.Tech/M.Sc/M.A) onwards		<b>From - To</b>	

10. Association with Scientific Bodies :

11. Details of appointments held including the current one:(in chronological order)

<b>Position</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Lab/Estt/Dte</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>

**PART- II**

I am reporting to.....

Tasks Completed	Set targets	Accomplishments	Comments & remarks by Initiating officer (IO)

**Guidelines**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects/ Assignments</li> <li>- Publication in journals</li> <li>- Scientific study report</li> <li>- Consultancy</li> <li>- Preparation of Technical manuals</li> <li>- S&amp;T outputs from workshops/ seminars</li> <li>- S&amp;T Management Course</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accuracy of the S&amp;T work report</li> <li>- Scientific merit of the work done</li> <li>- Lectures delivered</li> <li>- Books edited or written</li> <li>- Annual reports prepared</li> <li>- Awards /membership of Institutions/Academies</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

-----

**Candidate's viewpoint**

- Satisfaction with work
- Working environment
- Change required, if any

Date:.....

Date: .....

Signature of the Assessee .....

Signature of the IO: .....

**PART- III**

**Performance Review Conversations**

*(This part is associated with motivational component and anything discussed in this section, either positive or negative shall not have any adverse consequences on the overall assessment)*  
**(To be filled in by the Initiating Officer)**

(Duration: A minimum of 30 minutes)

Key issues discussed with respect to:

**a) WORK OUTPUT**

(Accomplishments of targets, facilitating factors/ impediments to performance etc.)

[Empty rounded rectangular box for Work Output notes]

**b) APTITUDES, TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF THE ASSESEE TO EXCEL IN THE FIELD**

[Empty rounded rectangular box for Aptitudes, Training and Development Needs notes]

**c) PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES**

(Temperament, attitude, behavior etc. and corrections suggested, if any)

[Empty rounded rectangular box for Personality Attributes notes]

Cut it from here.

Station: ..... ..

Date: ..... (Signature of the Assessee) ..... (Signature of the IO)

**Part III (Contd)**

**d) TARGETS SETTING OF THE NEXT YEAR:**

S. No.	TARGETS Projects/Assignments/Assignments, Publications

<p>Signature of the assessee: _____ Signature of the IO: _____</p> <p>Name of assessee: _____ Name of the IO: _____</p> <p>Date of conduct of performance review conversations: _____ To be filled by IO</p>
--

Copy to:

- Initiating Officer
- Candidate
- Current APAR
- Next APAR

**PART- IV**

**Performance Rating of Scientists (Middle Level)**

Name & Rank of IO: \_\_\_\_\_ Name & Rank of RO: \_\_\_\_\_

Work output (40%)							
Attributes	Rating X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	Rating Y
1. SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS/ASSIGNMENTS	Exceptionally wide , thorough & up-to-date professional knowledge	.	.	.	.	.	Restricted & superficial knowledge
2. WORK QUALITY	Accepting job challenges and identify with larger goals of the organization	.	.	.	.	.	Very low work output
3. WORK QUANTITY	Exceptionally good quality of work	.	.	.	.	.	Poor Quality of work
4. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES	Aware of subsequent laws and order of own organisation	.	.	.	.	.	Poor awareness of the subsequent rules & regulations
Signature/Date	IO Total						Grand Total: Work Output RO X 5 X .4 =
Signature/Date	RO Total						

Personal Attributes (30%)							
1. ATTITUDE	Optimistic	.	.	.	.	.	Pessimistic
2. TRUST WORTHINESS	Develop as a trustworthy member of the organization	.	.	.	.	.	Difficult to rely upon
3. FUTURE PERSPECTIVE	Forthcoming perspective of approach upright	.	.	.	.	.	Unclear in approach. No innovativeness
4. LEADERSHIP SKILLS	Outstanding in planning & organizing	.	.	.	.	.	Poor in planning & organizing
5. SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT	Excellent mentor	.	.	.	.	.	Not able to guide in an appropriate manner
6. MONITORING	Ability to communicate and receptive to ideas of others	.	.	.	.	.	Tend to be partial & biased
7. MEETING DEADLINES	Adhere to the timings & capacity to work with deadlines	.	.	.	.	.	Poor time management
8. RESOURCEFULNESS	Highly resourceful	.	.	.	.	.	Poor in arranging resources
9. TACTFUL HANDLING OF CONFLICTS	Able to resolve conflicts within organization	.	.	.	.	.	Unable to resolve conflicts within organization
10. TEAM BUILDING	Able to develop excellent project team	.	.	.	.	.	Unable to develop project team
Signature/Date	IO Total						Grand Total: Personal Attributes RO x 2 x .3 =
Signature/Date	RO Total						

Functional Competency (30%)							
1. SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE & ITS APPLICATIONS	Keep updated with scientific knowledge	.	.	.	.	.	Feeling of obsolescence
2. CLARITY OF GOALS	Clear & objective about the projects in hand	.	.	.	.	.	Unclear goals
3. STRATEGIC PLANNING	Produces many new & good ideas for the growth of the scientists & organization	.	.	.	.	.	Seldom come with original ideas
4. DECISION MAKING ABILITY	Excellent interaction with other disciplines	.	.	.	.	.	Poor interaction with other disciplines
5. ADMINISTRATIVE INITIATIVES & KNOWLEDGE	Remarkably good at assessing & coming out with resolutions	.	.	.	.	.	Poor at assessing & unable to resolve
Signature/Date	IO Total						Grand Total: Functional Competency RO x 4 x .3 =
Signature/Date	RO Total						

Work Output Score:		Personality Attributes Score:		Functional competency score:		Grand Total:	
Final Grading by Head of Establishment :		Signature of Head of Estb.					

**\*Outstanding (5), Very Good (4), Average (3), Below average (2) and Poort (1)**

**PART- IV (contd.)**

**REMARKS BY IO:**

I. Comments on extra assignments, to facilitate the organisational efforts:

[Empty rounded rectangular box for comments on extra assignments]

II. Integrity and moral fibre of assessee:

BEYOND DOUBT/ DOUBTFUL

III. Attitude towards Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, Weaker Sections of the society:

(Comment on understanding of the problems of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, Weaker Sections of the society only if he/she is dealing with their development and protection)

PARTIAL/ IMPARTIAL

IV. Adverse remarks, if any:

[Empty rounded rectangular box for adverse remarks]

Date: .....

Signature of the RO: .....

**PART- V**

Remarks of RO: Reference to strengths/weakness. Please record your observations other than the points already covered by IO.

[Large empty rounded rectangular box for RO remarks]

Date:.....

Signature of the RO:.....

**PART VI**

**REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE OFFICER / HEAD OF THE ESTT**

The head of the Estt will give the final rating and normalize as per the table given below:

APAR – NUMERICAL GRADING (X)		RATING	GRADINGS AWARDED
Outstanding	90-100		
Very Good	80-90		
Average	70-80		
Below average	40-70		
Poor	< 40		

- APARs graded between 90 to 100 will be rated as ‘Outstanding’ and will be rounded off accordingly 90 or 95 for the purpose of calculating average scores for empanelment or promotion.
- APARs graded between 80 and 90 will be rated as ‘Very good’ and will be given a score of 85.
- APARs graded between 70 and 80 will be rated as ‘Average’ and will be given a score of 75.
- APARs graded between 40 and short of 70 will be rated as ‘Below average’ and will be given a score of 60.
- APARs graded below 40 will be rated as ‘Poor’ and will be given a score of 40.

(Please comment on reasons for awarding less than 70% marks)

Any adverse remarks, if any, been communicated to the assessee? If yes, then details

**Accepting Officer/Head of the Estt.**

.....  
 Date : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Station : \_\_\_\_\_

.....  
 Name : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Designation: \_\_\_\_\_



**PART VII**

**DECLARATION**

I Dr. Ms/Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ have carefully read the Annual Performance Appraisal Report for the year \_\_\_\_\_.

Signature of the Scientist: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME (IN BLOCK LETTERS): .....

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Place: \_\_\_\_\_

**PART VIII**

**FORMAT FOR REPRESENTATION**

Name and grade of the Scientist : \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory/ Establishment : \_\_\_\_\_

Period of Report : \_\_\_\_\_

Grievances:

Empty rounded rectangular box for Grievances.

Signature of the Assessee ..... Date .....

Remarks of the representing authority if applicable

Empty rounded rectangular box for Remarks of the representing authority if applicable.

Signature of the Representing Authority..... Date .....